

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 22, 2004. Claims 30 to 36 are in the application, of which Claims 30, 35 and 36 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The change requested for page 1 of the specification has been effected.

Applicants thank the Examiner for her indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 33. In keeping with this indication, new Claims 35 and 36 have been added, and each includes the feature of a plurality of prisms arranged on specifically-claimed surfaces. Allowance of Claims 35 and 36 is therefore respectfully requested.


Claims 30 to 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 5,977,124 (Altfather). The rejection is respectfully traversed, for the reason that the layout of prisms in Altfather's Figure 2 is different from that claimed herein.

Specifically, the invention relates to an arrangement of prisms in a liquid container such as an ink tank. According to one aspect of the invention as set forth in the rejected claims herein, the plurality of prisms are arranged in a top edge direction of the plurality of prisms.

One representative arrangement of prisms is shown in Figures 14 and 16 of the subject application. As seen there, the plurality of prisms is arranged in a top edge direction of the plurality of prisms. Particularly in situations where the liquid container is used in a printing apparatus where a scanning direction of scanning means is crossed to a

top edge direction of the prisms (see, for example, Claim 32), this arrangement of prisms makes the positional arrangement between the liquid container and optical detection means non-critical.

In entering the rejection over Altfather, the Office Action took the position that Altfather's Figure 2 showed an arrangement of prisms in which plural prisms are arranged in a top edge direction of the plurality of prisms. Applicants respectfully disagree. Rather, as shown in Altfather's Figure 2 (reproduced below), the top edge direction of the plurality of prisms is an "into-the-page" direction:



where a circled-x marking has been inserted to indicate the "into-the-page" direction of the top edge of Altfather's prisms.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Altfather's prisms are not arranged in a top edge direction of the plurality of prisms, such that the rejection under § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Michael K. O'Neill  
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 8963v1